

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 38082

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2011 Unpublished Opinion No. 497
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: May 27, 2011
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
BRENT LEE WALLER,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Thomas F. Neville, District Judge.

Order relinquishing jurisdiction, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Eric D. Fredericksen, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GRATTON, Chief Judge; GUTIERREZ, Judge;
and MELANSON, Judge

PER CURIAM

In this case we are asked to determine whether the district court abused its discretion in refusing to grant probation following a period of retained jurisdiction. We are also asked to review a modified unified sentence of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years, for felony driving under the influence (DUI). We affirm.

Brent Lee Waller pled guilty to one count of felony DUI. I.C. §§ 18-8004, 18-8005(6). In exchange for his guilty plea, additional charges were dismissed. Following his plea, Waller was sentenced to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of two years. The district court retained jurisdiction for 180 days, and Waller was sent to participate in the rider program at the North Idaho Correctional Institution (NICI).

After Waller completed evaluation at NICI, the jurisdictional review committee recommended probation. The district court relinquished jurisdiction, but sua sponte reduced Waller's sentence to a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years. Waller appeals, claiming that the district court erred by refusing to grant probation in light of the recommendation of the jurisdictional review committee. He also argues that his modified sentence is excessive and constitutes an abuse of discretion.

We note that the decision to place a defendant on probation or whether, instead, to relinquish jurisdiction over the defendant is a matter within the sound discretion of the district court and will not be overturned on appeal absent an abuse of that discretion. *State v. Hood*, 102 Idaho 711, 712, 639 P.2d 9, 10 (1981); *State v. Lee*, 117 Idaho 203, 205-06, 786 P.2d 594, 596-97 (Ct. App. 1990).

The record in this case shows that the district court properly considered the information before it and determined that probation was not appropriate. We hold that Waller has failed to show that the district court abused its discretion, and we therefore affirm the order relinquishing jurisdiction.

Waller also contends that the unified sentence ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years, is excessive and constitutes an abuse of discretion. Sentences are reviewed for an abuse of discretion. Our appellate standard of review and the factors to be considered when evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence are well-established. *State v. Burdett*, 134 Idaho 271, 1 P.3d 299 (Ct. App. 2000); *State v. Sanchez*, 115 Idaho 776, 769 P.2d 1148 (Ct. App. 1989); *State v. Reinke*, 103 Idaho 771, 653 P.2d 1183 (Ct. App. 1982); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 650 P.2d 707 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007).

Waller argues that all of the relevant goals of sentencing could have been accomplished with probation. As noted above, however, the district court found that probation was not an appropriate course of action in Waller's case. The record does not indicate that a unified term of ten years, with a minimum period of confinement of one and one-half years, was an abuse of discretion in this case. Accordingly, the sentence is affirmed.

The order of the district court relinquishing jurisdiction and Waller's sentence are affirmed.